

REMARKS

After the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1-10 and 12-18 are currently pending in this application. Claim 11 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, 13, and 15 have been amended to better distinguish the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. In the specification, paragraphs [0020] and [0027] have been amended to correct informalities. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification due to informalities with regard to paragraphs [0020] and [0027]. In paragraph [0020], "unit22" has been amended as "unit 22", and "a user pattern monitor device 22" has been amended as "a user pattern monitor device 24". In paragraph [0027], "the user I/O device 12" has been amended as "the user I/O device 20". Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 3 and 15 because of informalities. Claims 3 and 15 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the claims 3 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 1-4 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,560,453 to Henry, Jr. et., hereinafter referred to as "Henry".

The present invention is an electronic device configured to analyze user inputs, determine user interaction patterns, correlate particular user inputs with particular device parameter settings, and adjust parameter settings in response to recognized user inputs.

Regarding claim 1, claim 1 as amended discloses an electronic device comprising a use pattern monitoring device configured to monitor user use patterns and parameter settings associated with particular use patterns, and to correlate particular use patterns with particular device parameter settings. The cognitive logic device analyses all of the information gathered by the monitoring device and determines appropriate parameter adjustments based on recognized user input.

To the contrary, the device taught by Henry is configured to balance responsiveness to incoming calls with power consumption in accordance with a user defined operating environment. (see column 2, lines 33-37 and column 4, lines 56-65 of Henry). Unlike the cognitive logic device of the present application, the SCI manager program module 74 of the Henry device does not analyze user use patterns, device parameter state, and correlation information to determine appropriate usage parameter adjustments. Instead, the SCI module is limited to determining a frequency with which a paging channel is scanned for an incoming call based on a current operating environment. (see column 5, lines 49-53 of Henry). The "current operating environment", however, is not *determined* as a result of an analysis performed by the SCI module 74. Instead, the "current operating environment" is provided to the SCI module 74 via a user by selecting a user-defined operating mode associated with a particular operating environment. (see column 5, lines 59-65). Based on this selected operating mode, the SCI module 74 adjusts a SCI parameter (i.e., the frequency with which a paging channel is examined).

In addition, unlike the use pattern monitoring device of the present application, the usage pattern performance mode module 86 of Henry is not configured to monitor usage patterns, parameter settings, and determine correlations between particular use patterns and parameter settings. Instead, the

usage pattern module 86 of Henry determines whether a particular user-defined performance mode has been selected, and if "true", the usage pattern module 86 collects incoming call statistics. (see column 8, lines 36-44 of Henry). These incoming call statistics are later used to determine the paging channel monitoring frequency. (see column 8, lines 66-68 of Henry). As indicated above, this usage pattern module 86 is neither configured to monitor various types of user inputs, parameter state information, nor generate correlations between user inputs and various parameters.

Accordingly, since the Henry fails to disclose a use pattern monitoring device and a cognitive logic device configured in accordance with the present invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Henry.

Claims 2-4 are dependent upon claim 1, which the Applicants submit is allowable over the cited art for the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Regarding claim 12, claim 12, as amended, discloses an integrated circuit comprising the components described above with regard to claim 1. Since Henry fails to disclose an integrated circuit comprising a use pattern monitoring device and a cognitive logic device configured in accordance with the present invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable over the cited art for the same reasons provided above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim 13, claim 13, as amended, discloses a method for use in the electronic device of claim 1. As described above, Henry does not disclose monitoring user usage patterns, parameter settings, and determine correlations between particular use patterns and parameter settings. Instead, Henry discloses determining whether a particular user-defined performance mode has been selected, and if "true", collecting incoming call statistics. (see column 8, lines 36-44 of Henry). These incoming call statistics are later used to determine the paging channel monitoring frequency. (see column 8, lines 66-68 of Henry).

Accordingly, since Henry fails to disclose all of the steps disclosed by claim 13 of the present Application, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13, as amended, is not anticipated by Henry.

Claims 14-16 are dependent upon claim 13, which the Applicants submit is allowable over the cited prior art of record for the same reasons provided above with respect to claim 13.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-4 and 11-16 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 6, claim 6, as amended, discloses a WTRU configured substantially the same as the electronic device of claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Henry and Official Notice fails to disclose all of the features of claim 6. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable over the cited art for the same reasons provided above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 7-10 are dependent upon claim 6, which the Applicants submit is allowable over the cited prior art of record for the same reasons provided above with respect to claim 6.

Claims 5 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,952,992 to Helms, hereinafter referred to as "Helms".

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 depends from claim 1, which Applicants submit is not anticipated by Henry. Helms discloses a method and apparatus for automatically adjusting the brightness of an LCD based on ambient lighting conditions. Since Helms also fails to disclose a use pattern monitoring device and a cognitive logic device configured in accordance with the present invention, the combination of Henry and Helms fails to disclose the electronic device of claim 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is not obvious in view of Henry and Helms.

Regarding claim 17, claim 17 depends from claim 13, which Applicants respectfully submit is not anticipated by Henry. Since Helms also fails to disclose monitoring user usage patterns, parameter settings, and determining correlations between particular use patterns and parameter settings, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Henry and Helms fails to disclose the method of claim 17. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is not obvious in view of Henry and Helms.

Regarding claim 18, claim 18 discloses a method for use with the electronic device of claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Henry and Helms fails to disclose the features of claim 18 for the same reasons cited above with respect to claim 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is not unpatentable over Henry in view of Helms.

Conclusion


If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicant: Ozluturk et al.
Application No.: 10/726,372

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-10 and 12-18, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Ozluturk et al.

By  _____
Richard L. Cruz
Registration No. 52,783

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

RLC/slp